

with his cell phone, and replays the scene as if it were a video game. He dropped out of school a year ago and says he made the most of the occasion by burning many cars, "including ones that belonged to neighbors."

Mamad, 25, says that every day for the last four years, the police "have re-

ally been hassling us. They ask for papers three times a day, sometimes when we are just waiting for the elevator. Before Sarkozy came along, it was "Good day. May I see your papers, please?" Now, its "OK, you little s**t, lie down on the hood of that car with your hands up and keep your trap shut."

Karim has some final words of warning: "Don't try to put us to sleep by asking us to wait indefinitely. For now, it's just kids having a good time burning cars. . . . But us, we ain't playing around. We want answers, not just more talk. Otherwise, make no mistake: there's gonna be war." **Ω**

The Man to Watch

Call them "scum" but give them preferences.

Nicholas Sarkozy, the 50-year-old French interior minister, is likely to play a key role in any decisions France makes in light of the riots. He is a curious combination of tough talk and accommodation, who has emerged from the chaos as the odds-on favorite for the presidential elections in 2007.

Early in the riots, Mr. Sarkozy took media center stage by calling the rioters *racaille*, which means "rabble" or "scum." This single word turned more people against Mr. Sarkozy than against the rioters. Muslim leaders insisted that he be fired, saying they did "not consider Sarkozy an appropriate negotiating partner"—as if there were anything to negotiate.

Noel Mamère, leader of the Green Party, actually called Mr. Sarkozy "a danger for French democracy," and *l'Humanité*, the Communist newspaper, said he was "an arsonist pretending to be a fireman." Hugues Lagrange, a researcher at the Paris Observatory of Social Change, said "Sarkozy's choice of words makes me think of the rhetoric used by military police in racial dictatorships, and of regimes practicing ethnic cleansing." Even President Chirac indirectly condemned Mr. Sarkozy's language, saying that "the law shall be firmly applied, but in a spirit of respect and dialogue."

Sensing correctly that the public was behind him, Mr. Sarkozy stuck to his guns. On a November 10 television broadcast, he repeatedly used the word *racaille*, saying, "They are thugs, scum, I repeat it and stand by it." "I'd like someone to tell me," he went on, "just what to call someone who attacks fire-

men, who stones them, who tosses a washing machine off an apartment building onto firemen? Young man? Sir? . . . Stop calling them 'youths.'"

The public loved it; the loonies were nonplussed. "While intellectuals, social workers, journalists and the left were offended, the man and woman in the street were not," was the lame conclusion of



Is he just demagoguing on votes for foreigners in local elections?

"Merde, I figured I'd have kicked you all out by now." (From Yahoo News, France.)

Pascal Perrineau, head of the Center for the Study of French Politics.

The public was again pleased when Mr. Sarkozy ordered regional authorities to deport all foreign rioters, even those in France legally. The plan bogged

The Greens called Nicholas Sarkozy "a danger for French democracy."

down in lawsuits, but roused the usual chorus. A group of 20 "human rights" organizations joined the Greens, Communists and the Revolutionary Communist League in calling deportation "manifestly illegal," and accused Mr. Sarkozy of "scapegoating" foreigners.

Mr. Sarkozy likes to deport people. On Nov. 30, he noted that his depart-

ment deported 15,000 illegal immigrants in 2004 and was on track for 20,000 in 2005. "I have set a target of 25,000 for 2006," he said, adding that "I have embarked on a policy of systematically sending people back." In 2003 he said if Muslim prayer leaders preached hatred he would strip them of citizenship and send them home. As good as his word, he has booted nearly 40.

Nor does he make excuses for rioters. On Nov. 15, during the parliamentary session on extending the curfew law for another three months, he lamented that "just 15 minutes from the center of Paris . . . French citizens triple-lock their doors, and live—or rather survive—with fear in their hearts." Noting "the multiple and massive expenditures on the projects," he said the results were "not commensurate with the sacrifices we have placed on the taxpayer."

Mr. Sarkozy has even sniffed around the edges of the real problem. On Nov. 10, he told television network France 2: "An immigrant child from black Africa has more problems than one from Sweden or Denmark or Hungary. That's because of culture, because of polygamy, because of difficult social origins."

He says past governments have been too cowardly to institute an immigration policy that meets the needs of France rather than the needs of immigrants, and that generosity towards immigrants has become indulgence. He wants to redirect feel-good welfare—subsidized vacations, clubs, soccer fields—to serious job training.

Some of his proposals are surprisingly soft. In 2001 he said a good way to assimilate immigrants would be to let them vote in local elections, but most controversial is his support for *discrimination positive*. France has avoided preferences

by pouring money into neighborhoods. He says France must target individuals, and this means preferences:

"I'm shocked that there are no non-white police chiefs, judges, generals, or

high officials. France is a multitude, and there are riches in that multitude. I don't want to see just one French elite." "French-style positive discrimination doesn't mean quotas," he adds. "It means

creating real equal opportunity."

Much can happen between now and the 2007 elections, but no one is likely to have a greater impact on the debate than Nicholas Sarkozy. **Ω**

How Preferences Really Work

Steven Farron, *The Affirmative Action Hoax*, Seven Locks Press, 2005, 405 pp., \$18.95 (softcover).

A lesson for us—and for the French.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

Over the last 40 years, racial preferences for non-whites have wormed their way into virtually every corner of our lives. Whites were at first silent about institutionalized discrimination against themselves, but slowly began to object. Since the 1980s, there has been increasing criticism of "affirmative action," but few authors can match Steven Farron for thoroughness, clarity, and utter disregard for contemporary pieties about race.

Prof. Farron, who left his job as a professor of classics at University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg in 2000 to study racial questions, stakes out his position early on: Affirmative action is "vicious anti-White discrimination." It corrupts every institution it touches. The people who practice it lie about it. When they are forbidden to discriminate, they just try harder to cover their tracks. Their victims are *whites*—not deserving Asians or competent blacks whose achievements are devalued. And finally, they can never, ever succeed because the races are not equal. *The Affirmative Action Hoax* may well be the first book-length treatment of preferences that pulls no punches and respects no taboos.

It Begins With the Jews

As Prof. Farron correctly argues, a large part of the problem with "affirmative action" is that it is shot through with lies—beginning with the ridiculous euphemism itself. If the country wants to discriminate against whites, it should do so honestly and efficiently. This means using the best measures for evaluating candidates, and then boosting the scores of favored groups. The best evaluations, whether for college or on the job, are standardized tests. They predict performance better than interviews, recom-

mendations, or past experience but they highlight racial differences in ability.

Therefore, if Harvard uses the best measures to admit only the smartest students it will get almost no blacks or Hispanics. If it is determined to have some, it should put them through the same objective evaluation and then boost their scores just enough to fill a quota. Prof. Farron is adamant: quotas and open score-boosting are the only honest, efficient way to practice preferences and get the best candidates of all races. Instead, recruiters downplay objective measures of candidates—precisely because they



accentuate racial differences—and fill quotas for non-whites through jiggery pokery, protesting all the while that they are not lowering standards.

Prof. Farron introduces this subject from an unusual perspective: a summary of how American universities used to keep out Jews. He argues that the dodges the old WASP elite used parallel what goes on today; dishonesty goes back a long way.

Before standardized testing, admission to even the best schools was very informal. People with enough money for tuition and who knew they were from the right social classes went to the Ivy League. There were not even limits on class size at places like Harvard and Yale, and schools chose whomever they liked.

In 1899 the College Entrance Examination Board was established to give colleges an objective test for evaluating candidates. The Ivies started selecting

for academic ability, and high-scoring Jews began to pour in. WASPs conceded that Jews were smart but thought they were boors. Rather than establish limits on Jewish enrollment, colleges came up with indirect ways to keep them out. Even before the First World War, Columbia began to claim "geographic distribution" was important, and went looking for students beyond heavily-Jewish New York City. The real purpose, as one administrator put it, was to get "Gentile boys of a desirable type." Not long after, state universities in the rest of the country started charging out-of-state students higher tuition fees; Prof. Farron says it was mainly to keep out Jews.

In 1919, Columbia established the first college application form, in which it asked about extracurricular activities, and required essays and letters of recommendation. As the headmaster of the elite Horace Mann School put it, "it is clearly impossible to draw racial or class distinctions between applicants," but by claiming to look for candidates who showed "manliness" and "leadership" as well as brains, Columbia managed to keep the number of Jews between 17 and 20 percent from 1918 to 1945. Prof. Farron says Columbia should have dispensed with the "manliness" ruse and simply set a tight quota on Jews. That way, it could use objective criteria to get the best students but still keep the number of Jews down.

That is exactly what Harvard tried to do in 1922. It announced it was going to stick to objective admissions criteria but keep Jews to 15 percent. President Abbott Lowell expected praise for such an open, honest system but was greeted with so much outrage that Harvard had to start discriminating secretly like everyone else. It issued application forms (one question was "What change, if any, has been made since birth in your name or that of your father?"), resorted to "geographical distribution," and in 1926 limited the freshman class to 1,000. As President Lowell explained years later: "I tried, as you know, to find an open,